

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1998

Voice and self in adolescence: Exploring relationships among voice, self and friendship

Marjorie Lynn Bommersbach

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bommersbach, Marjorie Lynn, "Voice and self in adolescence: Exploring relationships among voice, self and friendship" (1998). *Theses Digitization Project*. 1830.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/1830>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

VOICE AND SELF IN ADOLESCENCE: EXPLORING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG
VOICE, SELF AND FRIENDSHIP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Masters of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Marjorie Lynn Bommersbach
March 1998

VOICE AND SELF IN ADOLESCENCE: EXPLORING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG
VOICE, SELF AND FRIENDSHIP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Marjorie Lynn Bombersbach

March 1998

Approved by:


Joanna Worthley, Chair, Psychology

MARCH 20 1998
Date


Gloria Cowan


Janet Kottke

ABSTRACT

Qualitative studies suggest girls face a crisis in adolescence in which they "lose voice" as they age, retreating into a "silenced, passive and ambivalent self-presentation" (Brown & Gilligan, 1992). However, aside from qualitative studies using elite samples, this phenomenon of adolescence has not been well studied. To address this need, a modified version of Jack & Dill's Silencing the Self Scale (STSS) was administered to 366 12-18 year old students in Southern California schools to assess "loss of voice." Because girls are said to self-silence in service of preserving relationships, friendship variables and relational orientation were measured to examine the context of self-silencing. Following the logic of relational theory (i.e., the need to avoid disconnection with others, Surrey, 1991), holding friendships important, participating in friendships, and having a relational self-orientation were expected to correlate positively with self-silencing. Conversely, having an independent self-orientation was expected to correlate positively with voice as was evidence of mutual and empathic friendship qualities. Overall,

results of a 2 X 3 between-subjects ANOVA revealed that STSS scores did not significantly differ by gender, nor by age, but post-hoc analyses of STSS factors revealed significant gender differences around different silencing themes: girls scored higher on the Negative Externalized Self factor, and boys higher on False Self and Unselfish Imperative factors. No gender difference was found on the final factor, Silencing Feelings. Friendship importance was positively and significantly related to self-silencing but students without close friendships were significantly more self-silencing than those with one or more close friends or "best friends." All supportive friendship qualities were related to increased voice, with girls demonstrating significantly higher scores than boys on all of these friendship measures. Examining columns of self-orientation variables revealed that boys used significantly more independent and group orientations, whereas girls employed significantly more relational self-statements. Contrary to the hypothesis, relational self-orientation was not related to self-silencing. Results suggest compliance to developmental social norms may drive differences in self-silence between girls and boys and that involvement in close friendships for

girls may actually protect adolescents from "losing voice."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee for guiding me through the process of completing this research project. I want to thank Dr. Joanna Worthley, for being willing to chair a thesis on a subject as equivocal as voice and self-silencing. Thank you for all of the provocative discussions we have shared in developing this project and for the reading of so many drafts and for the many corrections which have enabled me to write more clearly and think more critically.

Thank you Dr. Gloria Cowan for your constant support and inspiration to me as I developed this project. Thank you for your friendship, warmth and support and the modeling you provide for me as a feminist researcher. Thank you especially for your help and reading of the many revisions of my results and discussion section.

Thank you Dr. Jan Kottke, for your advice and input on this project, your statistical advice coupled with a great sense of humor helped me see the project through. I also wish to thank Dr. Dana Jack and Dr. Jeffrey Parker both for allowing me to use their measures and for giving me valuable input into the design of my study. I would like to thank California State University San Bernardino's Instructionally Related Programs for helping to fund my participation in conferences where I was able to present the results of this

study.

I would like to thank the many teachers and administrators in both Ojai and Colton who were so very helpful in allowing me to come into their classrooms and administer my surveys. I especially want to acknowledge the students who participated in my study, as well as the parents who gave them permission to do so. Finally, I want to thank my partner Dave for forcing me to learn more than I thought I cared to know about computer software programs in order to get this project accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
INTRODUCTION.	1
The Evolution of the Voice Construct	7
Meanings of Voice and Voice's Link to Self	12
Meanings of Silence	16
A Crisis of Disconnection	18
Theoretical Dilemmas: Cultural Feminism and Essentialism	21
Methodological Criticisms	24
Cross Cultural Perspectives of Self and Voice	26
Rationale for the Hypotheses	31
Summary of Hypotheses	36
METHOD	38
Participants	38
Measures	39
The Silencing the Self Scale	39
Friendship Quality Questionnaire	41
Friendship Participation	42

Friendship Importance	43
Self-Orientation	44
Procedure	46
RESULTS	49
Preliminary Analysis	49
Self-Silencing/Loss of Voice	55
Friendship Importance	57
Friendship Participation	58
Friendship Quality	59
Self-Orientation Differences	60
Self-Orientation and Self-Silencing	64
DISCUSSION	66
Loss of Voice	66
Negative Externalized Self	66
Unselfish Imperative	70
False Self	74
Silencing Feelings	76
Summary and Critique of Loss of Voice Findings	77
Friendship Importance	80
Friendship Participation	82
Friendship Quality	83

Self-Orientation and Gender.	84
Self-Orientation's Relationship with Self-Silencing	85
Summary of Findings	87
APPENDIX A: Adaptation of the Silencing the Self Scale90
APPENDIX B: Friendship Quality Questionnaire	93
APPENDIX C: Friendship Participation Item	95
APPENDIX D: Friendship Importance Evaluation	96
APPENDIX E: Self-Orientation	97
APPENDIX F: Criteria for Self-Orientation Categorization	98
APPENDIX G: Scoring Procedure for Self-Orientation Categorization	99
APPENDIX H: Consent Form to Participants	100
APPENDIX I: Demographic Items	102
APPENDIX J: Debriefing	103
REFERENCES104

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Items and Factor Loadings, Modified Silencing the Self Scale	50
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics on all Measures . .	56
Table 3. Correlations between Friendship Quality Measures and Measures of Self-Silencing . .	61
Table 4. Gender Differences, Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Orientation	63
Table 5. Correlations between Self-Orientation and Self-Silencing Scores	65

INTRODUCTION

Ten years old,
she knows what she knows
feet on the ground beneath her toes.
Fearless eyes, clear and wide,
she don't slip...she don't slide.

She's passion and rage,
quick to gauge,
world she wants she means to find.
Speaks her mind, she don't apologize,
she don't slip...she don't slide.

She don't slip, she don't slide,
She don't tell no polite lies.
She don't bite her lip
or swallow her pride,
she don't slip...she don't slide.

Almost a woman when the walls close in,
her young hearts vision begins to dim.
Gotta be nice, sugar not spice,
she don't slide....
It's a long hard lonely ride.

Judy Gorman © (1994) One Sky International Music

Recent research suggests that as girls move through adolescence, they lose the ability to articulate and describe their personal thoughts, truths and feelings (Brown, 1991a; Brown 1991b; Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Lyons & Hanmer, 1990).

"Loss of voice" is the term used to describe this

slippage into a more quieted, passive, ambivalent stage of development. "Loss of voice" has additionally been described as "loss of self" or "self-silencing" (Jack, 1991), "loss of courage" (Rogers, 1993), "loss of vision" (Brown, 1991a), "lack of healthy resistance" (Brown, 1991b), "disavowing" of self (Stern, 1991) and "sequestering of self" (Gilligan, 1994).

Until now, findings regarding "loss of voice" have been based on qualitative longitudinal studies employing interview data and personal narratives (e.g., Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Hanmer & Rogers, 1990; Gilligan & Rogers, 1993; Orenstein, 1995; Way, 1995). The majority of these studies show that when girls aged 10-12 are asked to identify wants, needs and feelings, they have no trouble doing so. But as they age, girls are less able to identify and describe their inner states. Instead, as girls move through adolescence, this research shows that girls' responses are characterized by increasing reticence, ambiguity and confusion.

"Loss of voice" or "sequestering of self" has also been described as a "crisis" of female adolescent development

(Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, et al., 1990; Gilligan, 1994) with suggested links to the onset of depression (Brown & Gilligan, 1993; Nolen-Hoeksema & Girkus, 1994) and eating disorders (Steiner-Adair, 1991; Tolman & Bebold, 1994) shown to also affect girls at this juncture. Indeed, self-silencing, eating disorders, depression, and pressures to be sexually active are "crisis" themes of female adolescent development identified in the recent bestseller Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls (Piper, 1994), and in Orenstein's (1995) Schoolgirls: Young women, self esteem and the confidence gap.

Loss of Voice, according to Gilligan and her colleagues (1990), revolves around a hypothesized "dilemma of inclusion" in which a girl must negotiate between including herself and including others in the process of identity formation. The idea that girls have a unique relational task to perform in the development of identity, (i.e., balancing self needs with others' needs), is also a focus of relational theory, developed by researchers at Wellesley College's Stone Center (Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver & Surrey, 1991). Originally called self-in-relation theory,

this theory delineates a relational perspective, encouraged through girls' socialization, which emphasizes the importance that "maintaining connections" has on girls' identity development (Jordan, et al., 1991). Thus, self-in-relation theory can be contrasted with the traditional view of psychological development in which successful identity development is achieved through the demonstration of increasing levels of separation, individuation and autonomy (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Freud, 1925).

"Voice" is a construct central to the relational perspective of human development, as "voice" is the conduit which connects "inner" and "outer" worlds and facilitates connection with others (Gilligan, 1994). But because discussions of the meanings of "voice" and silence are new to psychological inquiry and lack concise operational definitions, few studies addressing "loss of voice" have been attempted.

An exception is found in the work of Jack (1991), who recently employed a longitudinal design to study self-silencing and loss of voice in depressed women. From her longitudinal study of depressed women, she developed the

Silencing the Self Scale (STSS) (Jack & Dill, 1992), a quantitative measure of self-silencing and loss of voice. This measure assesses the use of self-silencing schemas employed by depressed women who themselves have reported using self-silencing strategies in order to maintain connection with important others in their lives.

The goal of the current study is to investigate adolescent self-silencing and "loss of voice" using a large, diverse sample, and employing a traditional quantitative approach. Due to reported differences in socialization and self concept formation (Jordan et al., 1991), the level of self-silencing between girls and boys may be expected to differ, but as yet, differences between girls and boys in degree of self-silencing have not been investigated.

In addition, to explore the contexts of silencing, a second goal of this study was to explore relationships between friendship and self-silencing. Following the logic of relational theory (Jordan et al., 1991) and the results of prior qualitative studies, it was expected that holding friendships important, being invested in friendships, and experiencing validation and mutuality in friendships, would

be related to reports of "voice" and silence in relationships.

In addition, prompted by the theoretical assumptions of relational theory which contrast the construction of "connected selves" with autonomously oriented selves, this study explored whether having a relational self-orientation is related to silencing and conversely, whether having an independent orientation is related to voices strength. It was hoped that the answers to these questions would provide us with a better understanding of self-silencing and the contexts of "loss of voice."

The study begins with a discussion of the development of the "voice" construct, the meaning of voice, silence, and voice's link to self. Next, the crisis of "connection" and "disconnection" is examined within the framework of relational theory. Then, criticisms and caveats regarding the adoption of a "relational" perspective will be addressed, followed by a critique of methodological problems in prior studies of loss of voice. Finally, alternatives to the traditional Euro-American definition of self will be offered, and in particular, self-in-relation theory will be

discussed as it provides the theoretical backdrop for the hypotheses to be tested.

The Evolution of the Voice Construct

The term "voice" referred to in this study reflects more than just the sound produced by vibration of the vocal chords. Instead "voice" involves not only sound but presence and As such it is a developmental construct. Among the first to study voice, "loss of voice," and its psychological significance was Gilligan (1982), who in her seminal work, In a Different Voice, exposes the absence of women's voices and experience in the development of mainstream psychological research and theory construction. In her specialty area of research, the development of moral reasoning, Gilligan noted that most existing research was based on studies using all male samples. Gilligan described how the construction of a major stage theory proposing developmental levels of moral reasoning (e.g., Kohlberg, 1976), was based on the voices, experiences and opinions of only men and boys (Gilligan, 1982). The "normative" information yielded from all male samples was used as the standard by which to measure both male and female moral

development (Gilligan, 1982). In applying this standard, Gilligan showed that those women who use a care/harm perspective in their moral reasoning are seen as less cognitively and morally sophisticated than men, who often reason from a "justice" perspective, then considered the hallmark of moral maturity (Colby et al., 1987; Kohlberg, 1976).

Gilligan then set out to include women's voices and experiences in the study of moral reasoning development by studying adolescent girls. To do that, she collaborated with Lyons and Hanmer (1990) and developed a five year longitudinal research project, called the Dodge Study, which took place at the Emma Willard Day and Boarding School for Girls in Troy, New York. Girls from the 9th to 12th grades were asked open-ended questions regarding their conceptions of self, relationships and morality. Using a phenomenological "voice-centered approach" (Brown & Gilligan, 1992), careful attention was given to the "voices" and experiences of these girls. The "voice" that they were listening to and for has been described as both "a channel of connection" (Brown & Gilligan, 1992) and a "channel of

psychic expression" (Brown & Gilligan, 1993) because, these authors claim, voice connects psyche with body. Moreover, because voice is language, voice reflects and resonates with psyche's link to culture (Brown & Gilligan, 1992).

The Dodge Study researchers discovered through listening intently to adolescent voices, that "voice" seemed to shut down and disappear as the girls matured. Girls who when questioned regarding moral reasoning prior to age twelve had no problem articulating wants, needs and desires became confused and reticent in their responses as they grew older. What researchers identified as a source of conflict for the girls was a struggle between "separate" and "relational" selves. This struggle is described by researchers as the "crisis" of female adolescent development and involves the competing demands of girls' desire to stay connected to others versus the need for authenticity and expression of personal truths (Brown & Gilligan, 1982).

Following the Dodge Study, several similar research projects were undertaken in three Boston neighborhoods using coeducational and more urban settings and yielding similar results (Gilligan, Johnson & Miller, 1988; Gilligan, Rogers

& Tolman, 1992; Gilligan, Ward & Taylor, 1988).

Following this, a more extensive five-year longitudinal and cross sectional study of the voices of pre-adolescent and adolescent girls was completed at the Laurel School (Brown & Gilligan, 1992), a private school in the Midwest. This elite sample consisted of one hundred mostly white, middle class girls, ranging from 7 to 18 years of age. The sample was made up of 25 second graders, 25 fifth graders, 20 seventh graders, and 30 tenth-graders. The girls in this study participated in open-ended interviews designed to encourage them to give an account of moral conflict and choice concerning themselves and their relationships. The participants were also measured on a variety of standard psychological measures assessing sociomoral reflection (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) and ego development (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970).

Because these girls were attending a private all-girls day school, which carries a privileged educational status and focuses on the needs of girls, the authors expected these girls to be thriving, alive and expressive. What they found, despite such advantages, was a clear distinction

between school-age and adolescent girls' willingness to speak, feel, and act in relationships. This discovery of girls' reticence created a paradox. Hand in hand with evidence of psychological progression (i.e., a movement away from egocentrism to a more differentiated self which is becoming more cognitively complex and better adapted to social and cultural conventions) was evidence of loss of voice and loss of authenticity regarding self and relationship (Brown & Gilligan, 1992).

A more recent qualitative study of the voices of girls was conducted by Way (1995) in which she studied urban working-class and poor adolescent girls. Way found that the ability to be outspoken and freely "speak one's mind" in relationships was the most prevalent theme occurring among the girls she interviewed. The girls in this study could express anger and disagreement as well as care and connection in relationships with parents, teachers and female friends.

This finding is inconsistent with prior voice studies and may be due to the small sample size and to a differing context in which expressions of voice are paramount to

attaining resources and assuring one's survival. But despite these differences, the girls in this study, in a manner more consistent with the girls in Gilligan et al.'s studies, were not willing to "speak their minds" in their relationships with boys.

Meanings of Voice and Voice's Link to Self

The Harvard Project on Women's Psychology and Girls' Development (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Rogers, 1993; Gilligan & Rogers, 1993) and work by Jack (1991) exploring women's depression and self-silencing has initiated the discussion of "voice" as a psychological construct and a source for exploring internal states. In this body of research, "voice" is defined in multiple ways, and each definition links voice to "self."

According to Jack (1991), "speaking one's feelings and thoughts is a part of creating, maintaining, and recreating one's authentic self" (p.32). Jack studied women's self-silencing and its link to depression in a two year longitudinal study of depressed women. She found that the women in her study "lost voice" in an attempt to avoid trouble in their important relationships. "Loss of voice"

was linked to "loss of self" and found to correlate with scores on depression scales in several samples of women (Jack & Dill, 1992).

Brown, who has studied loss of voice using a qualitative approach, defines "voice" as the "authorization" of one's own experience (Brown, 1991b). In her study of girls, Brown states that "to authorize" means to claim, name and resonate one's thoughts, feelings, and experiences. Naming, claiming and resonating provide clues to researchers about a girl's self-concept.

Brown further claims that to "authorize" and use "voice" indicates resistance and a willingness to challenge the norm of the "good girl." The "good girl," described often by participants in Brown's study, "speaks quietly, calmly, is always nice and kind, never mean and bossy, and has no bad thoughts or feelings" (Brown, 1991b, p.78). Brown claims self-silencing occurs in the creation and maintenance of an idealized "good girl" self-image in which the "good girl" participates in idealized relationships. In an idealized relationship, one acts good, acts nice, and doesn't speak their personal truths for risk of upsetting

the relationship.

In summary, Brown sees "voice" as indicating the capacity to resist idealizing a "good girl" self, and as resistance to idealized relationships. Use of one's "voice," according to Brown, reveals a willingness to be authentic and "stay with what one knows" (1991b, p.73).

Similarly, Rogers (1993), another Harvard Project researcher, describes "voice" as an indicator of everyday courage. Rogers, exploring the etymology of the word "courage," defines courage as the ability "to speak one's mind by telling all of one's heart." Thus courage is the intersection of both voice and heart.

Gilligan offers another link between voice and self with the interpretation of "voice" as an indicator of interpersonal loyalty. Gilligan borrows from Hirschman's analysis of organizations (1970) to illustrate the conflict and interplay created by two options, exit and voice in interpersonal relationships. The option to exit, is seen as the "less messy" alternative. In exiting, if one doesn't get what one wants, one leaves and goes elsewhere. Exit, in the context of interpersonal relationships, means leaving and

not speaking about objectionable situations. Gilligan and Hirschman interpret exit as indicating lack of loyalty to persons and situation. They both contrast exit with "voice," the option to "attempt to change rather than escape from an objectionable situation" (Gilligan, 1988, p. 141). Voice, in contrast to exit is "messy, cumbersome, and direct" (Gilligan, 1988, p.141) but indicates interpersonal investment and interpersonal loyalty.

A final definition of voice involves a discussion of power. Voice, according to Reinharz (1995), means "having the ability, the means and the right to express oneself, one's mind, and one's will" (p. 180). As such, Reinharz claims that voice serves as a rich metaphor for power relations. Having a voice which is heard, valued and understood is a source of empowerment and a means by which to derail oppression. Loss of voice may imply the acknowledged loss of the right, mind and will to express oneself. Gilligan's provocative claim is that this capitulation of women's voices is something like a rite of passage for girls in Western civilization (Gilligan, 1994).

Meanings of Silence

A counterpoint to explorations of voice is an exploration into the meanings of silence. In criticism of the "relational underpinnings" of Gilligan's "voice" construct, Mahoney (1993) stated that the use of silence, the option of not using one's voice, is as complex as the use of voice. Mahoney suggests that silence could be seen through a much less negative lens than is used by voice theorists. Silence, much in the way voice is described by Brown (1991), could also be viewed as an indicator of resistance (Mahoney, 1993). Mahoney suggested that silence-as-resistance may manifest itself in the creation of the psychological space needed to negotiate important contradictions. As such, silence could be interpreted as fertile ground for creativity and change (Mahoney, 1993).

Providing a literary example of this, author Isabel Allende uses silence as a way for her characters to negotiate difficult times and develop a sense of spirituality and self-growth. In House of the Spirits, the protagonist Ana becomes mute at the funeral of her sister, and her period of voicelessness provides the catalyst for

her development of supernatural powers. In her own life, Allende claimed silence provides the creative interlude in which she can integrate her life experience into meaningful stories (Allende, 1993).

However, in a contrasting and less magnanimous view of silence, Rich (1977) claimed "where language and naming are power, silence is oppression, is violence." Supporting Rich's claim, is research concerning women's ways of knowing by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986), who found that the women in their study who were categorized as silent came from families in which one or both parents were violent. So while silence may signal resistance, creativity and the development of strength, it may also indicate power abuse and oppression.

In their work investigating silence and voice, developmental researchers listening for "voice" mirror the way clinicians listen for changes of both strength and quality of voice to indicate changes or shifts in a client's internal states or feelings (Kelbert-Kelly, 1994). Listening for voice and silence in the lives of adolescents can similarly provide clues to the social context and power dynamics that help to shape a young person's life. Both

voice and silence are complex constructs which lend themselves to multiple meanings. Listening for both silence and "voice" in adolescence may provide important clues to the experience and intersection of outer and inner worlds (Gilligan, 1994).

A Crisis of Disconnection

Data collected by Gilligan and her colleagues (1990; 1992) reveal themes of concern over issues of connection and disconnection with others. Using an example from the Dodge study, Brown (1991b) describes how Jessie, at eight years old, understands that people have "different feelings" and may get hurt and disagree. She concludes this when asked to respond to a fable about a large porcupine who is hospitably invited to spend the winter with a family of moles. The moles later discover it is unbearable to live with a porcupine. So at eight, Jessie explains, porcupines and moles "just shouldn't be together." Her solution is to make the cave larger and to "make bigger paths" for the animals to walk together comfortably (p.75). In this scenario, each of the animals have their own space, and this would make all

of the animals happier, even though it would not resolve their differences.

For Jessie at nine, this fable becomes a more complicated matter to resolve. She can more clearly understand both sides of the dilemma; the discomfort of the moles juxtaposed with the need for the porcupine to have shelter in the winter. At nine, Jessie says, "You should be nice to your friends and communicate with them and not...do what you want" (p. 75). She wishes that porcupines and moles "are happy and they don't have to fight anymore. They could just be friends and stay like that forever" (p.76). There is no resolution, but a described wish for the dilemma to go away.

By eleven, when Jessie considers this fable, she decides the hole should be made bigger, because "it would be nice to have a neighbor in the house." She has come up with a resolution and what has shifted is Jessie's acknowledgment of the discomfort the porcupine brings to the household. At eleven, even though she believes it would be possible for the moles to say to the porcupine, "I don't want you here" and tell him to get out, that this would not be "a nice way

to do it." This is because the porcupine "might feel left out" (p.78). Also at eleven, Jessie says that if a girl really doesn't like another girl, she should "pretend that she likes her," so as not to make this girl upset and then not be a "perfect girl" (p.78). Further, at this age, Jessie states that it is important to agree with others, even if one really holds an opposite stance. In addition, Jessie says she will no longer say "I hate you" if she is mad at somebody. She fears at eleven the world will turn on her for not being nice and not behaving like a "good girl." By eleven, Jessie's response fully illustrates the fear she holds around possible disconnection with others.

The theme of a crisis in identity precipitated by the threat of disconnection is a primary consideration of Stone Center relational theorists, introduced earlier, and of developmental researchers at the Harvard Project on Women's Psychology and Girl's Development. In their studies of girl's and women's development, both groups of researchers are examining the centrality that concern over maintaining connections to others has in girl's and women's moral thinking and self-concept development. Both groups of

researchers frame this desire to preserve connections as a healthy part of girl's identity development. Further, they posit that the ability to negotiate and articulate the conflict of attending to others' needs while honoring self needs is a skill that once realized and valued, could be universalized as a new ethic of care and cooperation (Jordan, 1997; Westkott, 1997).

However, theory emphasizing women's concern over care and connection with others may be a precarious theoretical position for researchers, due to the negative way that a focus on care and connection has been conceptualized in the past. That is, emphasizing women's relational strengths can inadvertently support essentialist arguments regarding female attributes.

Theoretical Dilemmas: Cultural Feminism and Essentialism

Relational behavior historically has been viewed as a sign of dependency and immaturity (Stiver, 1991). This view is driven by traditional theories of identity development and self formation, which stress separation and differentiation from others as markers of maturity (e.g., Erikson, 1950; Levinson, 1978). Due to the way in which self

development has been conceptualized historically, emphasizing women's and girls' need for connectedness risks invoking the pathologizing of women as naturally dependent, immature or even "codependent" (Tavris, 1992).

Some feminist researchers have charged that a women-centered relational approach promotes "cultural feminism" and "essentialist" ideology (e.g., Bohan, 1994; Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988; Kerber, 1986; Tavris, 1992). Cultural feminism is a lens of the feminist perspective which values women's "difference," and recasts difference as valuable and/or better than traditional androcentric culture. Essentialism, which is often linked to cultural feminism, is the theoretical position which states that there are true fundamental differences between men and women. According to these analyses critical of both "cultural feminism" and "essentialist" perspectives risk being used by mainstream culture to keep women in their place (Bohan, 1994; Martin, 1994; Tavris, 1992). That is, claims that women are essentially more relational than men may be used to reinforce a "less than" status of women, particularly in light of the dominant Western psychological paradigm, where

the standard of "healthy" self is seen as autonomous, independent, and well differentiated (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1972). If women are assumed to be more relational in a society that doesn't value this skill, and men are seen as instrumental in a society which values independent instrumental behavior, then women will be "naturally" relegated to second class status.

This threat holds particular salience in a culture operating from Western dualisms of good/bad, and either/or thinking. Unfortunately, dualistic thinking lends itself to the creation of hierarchies and a desire to maintain the status quo (Holloway, 1994). Hence, women as "different" or women as "relational" quickly becomes code for women as "less than" (Bohan, 1994).

Yet, critics of these critics state that linking a "woman centered approach" to essentialism is a dismissive academic tactic (Martin, 1994). Martin and others (e.g., Doherty & Cook, 1992; Dupuy, 1994) argue that Gilligan and the writers from the Stone Center never offer an essentialist argument. Rather, these theorists claim, the differences between men and women noted by Gilligan and

others in communication, expectations, and self-concept, reflect socialization processes and cultural expectations rather than innate characteristics.

Further, the value of adopting a relational perspective may rest in its application to all people, not just women. A whole new realm of possibility may be open to humans who can acknowledge a more "related" nature of self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sampson, 1989).

Methodological Criticisms

Beyond criticisms which are theoretical in nature, criticisms of a "voice centered" and "woman centered" approach arise due to methodological problems associated with the use of qualitative data. Unquestionably, interview data are subject to interpretive bias and sample selection problems that reduce generalizability. However, the counter argument presented by feminist researchers and postmodernist scholars is that science itself is intrinsically biased (Bevan, 1991; Gilligan, 1982; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995; Kurtines, Alvarez, & Azanitia, 1991; Rogers, 1993; Sampson, 1993). Accordingly, frequently overlooked are the biases and omissions which also occur in more "controlled" quantitative

studies. Such biases occur in the creation of "objective" measures which may not tap the depth and reality of the experience of those being measured. The argument is: researchers are people, people operate from subjective perspectives, and subjectivity always enters any investigative picture (Kazdin, 1992). Subjectivity manifests itself in the form of what questions are asked, as well as in the many assumptions which are made about who or what we study. Thus, unacknowledged assumptions in quantitative approaches also provide limits to generalizability (Harding, 1987; Sampson, 1993).

Henwood and Pidgeon (1995) suggest that the fact that science must always appear neutral and objective reveals a bias against personal subjective experience. Voice researchers, and many others, question the validity of assuming an "objective" scientific stance in which the researcher is viewed as separate from the "subjects" which they study (Heckman, 1995; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995). An "objective," decontextualized stance, according to feminist researchers, is not actually humanly possible (Harding, 1987; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995). The feminist alternative

demonstrated by Gilligan and her colleagues is to identify the researcher's role, commitment and biases as an inevitable part of the research process. Accordingly, "voice" researchers claim they continually assess, examine and admit to the relationships formed between researchers and participants.

The goal of past qualitative studies of girls' voices has been descriptive and exploratory. While quantitative studies try to capture the relationships between selected variables and specific outcomes, qualitative studies fill in the rich tapestry and complexities of context through direct narrative.

Cross Cultural Perspectives of Self and Voice

The view of child and human development which portrays self as separate reflects a strong American cultural and political ideal which permeates developmental theory-- that is the press toward individuality, agency, and autonomy (Guisinger & Blatt, 1993; Jordan et al., 1991; Sampson, 1993). Cross cultural research on identity development and self formation has called into question both the assumptive importance and universality of a young person's process of

separating from others in the development of self (Markus, Mullally & Kitayama, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sampson, 1989). Such research has identified two general types of self orientation: an independent self-orientation and an interdependent self-orientation (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). These two views of self can be seen to reflect cultural differences in Eastern and Western thought and values (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) although they coexist in varying strengths among both Eastern and Western populations. In cross-cultural research, Westerners (e.g., Americans, Australians and British participants) demonstrate a stronger independent self-orientation, while Asians, East Indians and Africans demonstrate more interdependent self-orientations (Markus et al., 1996; Singelis, 1991).

The independent view of self is the most familiar to Euro-Americans, and it is the view in which the healthy self is conceptualized as a separate, boundaried, autonomous agent, concerned with control and efficacy (Markus et al., 1995). In addition, the Western self is defined as composed of attributions and traits which are conceived of as

internally derived and unique. According to the Western view of self, self is attained by separation and differentiation from others, and by expressing uniqueness and maintaining a sense of control, especially in relation to others. To do this, Euro-Americans and other Westerners are encouraged to be both direct and expressive. One of the ways this might be accomplished in Western culture is to speak out, or to use one's "voice."

In contrast, an interdependent self-orientation views self as permeable, variable and context-dependent, as self is comprised and defined through one's relationships with others (Singelis, 1997). This typically more Eastern view of self has also been called a collectivist self-orientation, as there is an emphasis on group goals rather than individual goals in self-development. According to this view, it is the "other" or "self-in-relation-to-other" that is the focus of individual experience (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Self goals from an interdependent orientation are to fit in, harmonize with, and understand others. These goals are achieved by being indirect, being able to "read others' minds" and anticipate others' needs. One may infer that to

build an interdependent self, one may need to employ more silence than voice.

Relational theory contributes yet a third way to understand self-orientation in which the self is seen as individual but at the same time connected to others (Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand & Yuki, 1995).

Research based on relational theory suggests that Euro-American women construct individual selves which are construed more relationally than men (Belenky et al, 1986; Jordan et al, 1991). The relational view of self is to be distinguished from the Eastern interdependent view of self, where self is strongly tied to a group identity and in-group focus. In contrast, in a relational orientation, the self is considered individualistic while attuned to interconnections with others. This interconnection with other individual selves is framed as augmenting, empowering and enhancing the growth of individual selves. Maintaining important connections to others is seen as a vehicle to self empowerment and mutual growth (Jordan, 1997). From this perspective, internal attributes are balanced, shaped and enhanced in the context of important relationships.

The goal of the relational self is thus growth toward authenticity, uniqueness and differentiation, which paradoxically, can be achieved through connection and interaction with others (Jordan, 1997; Miller, 1976).

Through the lens of relational theory, a girl's identity can be seen as developing in synchrony with her relationships (Jordan et al., 1991). Constructs central to relational theory include empathy, intimacy, authenticity, and a mutuality involving cognitive and emotional intersubjectivity (Gilligan, 1982; Jordan et al., 1991).

Cognitive and emotional intersubjectivity are defined as an "ongoing, intrinsic inner awareness and responsiveness to the continuous existence of the other or others, with an expectation of mutuality" (Surrey, 1983, p.61).

Intersubjective mutuality is a sophisticated cognitive and affective process and is what distinguishes relationship from attachment (Surrey, 1983).

Cross-cultural research has revealed that the way in which one construes self has important implications to how one behaves as a self. Therefore, there is reason to believe that one's self-orientation: independent, interdependent, or

relational may be related to use of voice or silence in relationships. Accordingly, one group of variables in this study includes measures of self-orientation to explore possible relationships between self-orientation and self-silencing in an adolescent sample.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

While the qualitative research reviewed above suggests that girls lose "voice" and are at risk for experiencing increased levels of self-silencing as they move through adolescence, the usefulness of these findings may be limited to select samples of girls. However, mounting anecdotal evidence that girls experience a crisis of identity and self expression during adolescence (Orenstein, 1995; Piper, 1995) warrant further investigation of this phenomenon. To address this need, this study explores "loss of voice" and self-silencing using a quantitative empirical methodology.

In concordance with the results of prior qualitative studies (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan et al., 1990) and relational theory, which posits boys are socialized toward greater autonomy, while girls feel a press to maintain connection with others (Dupuy, 1994; Miller, 1976, 1991;

Stiver, 1991), girls were expected to demonstrate more "loss of voice" than boys. The first hypothesis will test this assumption.

H-1) Girls demonstrate more self-silencing/loss of voice than boys.

In addition, girls may be expected to demonstrate increased levels of self-silencing as they age, as demonstrated in prior research (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan et al., 1990).

H-2) Self-silencing/loss of voice in girls demonstrates a developmental trend; with the oldest girls scoring higher on self-silencing than the younger girls.

This study also addresses the relational context of self-silencing by measuring voice's interaction with friendship variables including friendship importance, participation, and quality. Because prior qualitative studies indicate that girls silence themselves in order to maintain connections with others and to maintain their status as "good girls," it was expected that friendship importance (i.e., valuing having and keeping friends), would

be positively related to self-silencing.

H-3) Ratings of friendship importance correlate positively with self-silencing/loss of voice.

Using similar reasoning based on girl's desire to maintain connections with others, it was predicted that friendship participation, having a close and important friend, would be positively related to scores of self-silencing/loss of voice.

H-4) Ratings of friendship participation correlate positively with self-silencing/loss of voice.

To further explore the assertion that maintaining connections to others is related to self-silencing, dimensions of friendship quality were measured to see which qualities of friendship might be related to silence and voice. According to relational theory, self is bolstered and grows through empathic reciprocal interactions which allow "voice" to flourish and mutual understanding to develop (Dupuy, 1994; Surrey, 1991). Therefore, friendship qualities allowing voice and self-affirming exchanges in a relationship were expected to be negatively related to self-silencing/loss of voice (Dupuy, 1994). Accordingly, it was

predicted that scores measuring three supportive and interactive friendship qualities: Intimate Disclosure, Validation and Caring, and Conflict Resolution, would be negatively related to self-silencing/loss of voice.

H-5) Self-silencing/loss of voice is negatively related to the friendship qualities variables: Intimate Exchange, Conflict Resolution, and Validation and Caring.

In addition, other measures of friendship quality, Companionship and Recreation, Help and Guidance, and Conflict and Betrayal were explored in conjunction with self-silencing/loss of voice, but no hypotheses regarding specific relationships among these variables were offered.

Finally, possible relationships between self-silencing/loss of voice and self-orientation were investigated. As noted earlier, whether one construes self as independent, group-oriented or relational is likely to affect how one behaves as a self (Markus et al., 1996). Based on the logic of relational theory and the findings of Kashima et al. (1995) it was predicted that girls would demonstrate more relational self-orientations compared to

boys. Further, following relational theory's observations that boys are socialized more strongly than girls towards an independent, autonomous model of self, it was hypothesized that boys would demonstrate more independent self-orientations than girls (Dupuy, 1994; Jordan et al., 1991).

H-6) Girls' self-orientation is relational whereas boys self-orientation is independent.

Because prior studies have not found links between gender and a group/interdependent orientation (Kashima et al., 1995), gender predictions were not made.

Finally, the relationship between self-orientation and self-silencing was investigated. Following the logic of relational theory and results from prior qualitative studies of "loss of voice," it was hypothesized that other-focused self-orientations (i.e., both relational and group self-orientations) would be positively related to self-silencing/loss of voice, as both relational and interdependent orientations are linked to value systems which stress connections with others above expressions of self.

H-7) Relational and group self-orientations are

positively related to self-silencing/loss of voice.

Using the same logic, independent self-orientation was expected to be negatively related to self-silencing/loss of voice. This relationship was expected as being direct and expressing self--fostered in self systems and cultures where self is construed as independent, is reliant on the use of one's voice.

H-8) Independent self-orientation is negatively related to self/silencing and loss of voice.

Summary of Hypotheses

In summary, the following hypotheses were tested:

- 1) Girls demonstrate more self-silencing/loss of voice than boys.
- 2) Self-silencing/loss of voice in girls demonstrates a developmental trend, with the oldest girls scoring higher on self-silencing than the younger girls.
- 3) Ratings of friendship importance correlate positively with self-silencing/loss of voice.
- 4) Ratings of friendship participation correlate positively with self-silencing/loss of voice.
- 5) Self-silencing/loss of voice is negatively related

to the friendship qualities variables: Intimate Exchange, Conflict Resolution, and Validation and Caring.

6) Girls' self-orientation is relational while boys self-orientation is independent.

7) Interdependent self-orientations (relational and group self-orientations) are positively related to self-silencing/loss of voice.

8) Independent self-orientation is negatively related to self/silencing and loss of voice.

METHOD

Participants

Three hundred and seventy-four students were recruited from seventh through twelfth grade classrooms from four southern California public schools after permission was secured from administrators, teachers, and parents. Eight surveys were not included in the analysis due to incomplete data, yielding a total of 366 participants, consisting of 235 girls and 131 boys with ages ranging from 12 to 18. Students were sampled from two working through middle class southern California school districts, one urban and the other more rural. As there were no significant differences between participants' scores on the dependent variables from the two districts, the rural and urban samples were combined. The participants identified themselves as 3.3% African American, 32.8% Hispanic, 2.2% Asian-American, 3% American Indian, 56% Caucasian and 2.5% other. While there were significantly more Caucasian participants (139) as compared to Hispanics (36) from the rural school district, $X^2 = 42.83$ (1), $p = .00$, both rural and urban samples were combined as there were no significant differences on the

dependent variables based on ethnicity.

For purposes of analysis, the students were divided into three age groups to test for developmental differences on scores for dependent variables. The three age groups were based on ages, reported in years and months, of 7th, 9th, 11th and 12th grade students. The age ranges of the three groups were broken into two year increments and ranged from 12-13.91 years ($n = 116$), 14-15.91 years ($n = 121$), and 16-18.66 years ($n = 129$).

Measures

The Silencing the Self Scale (STSS). Self-silencing/loss of voice was assessed using Jack's (1992) Silencing the Self Scale (STSS). Jack developed the STSS based on a two year longitudinal study of depressed women. The overall scale measures the use of cognitive schemas of self-silencing participants use in their close relationships. Four rationally derived subscales have been offered by Jack: Externalized Self-Perception (judging the self by external standards), Care as Self-sacrifice (maintaining attachments by putting others' needs first),

Silencing the Self (not expressing one's feelings and opinions for fear of damaging or losing a relationship), and the Divided Self (presenting to the world a false social self, while the inner self grows angry and hostile). The content categories of these subscales seem to capture the behaviors reported in qualitative studies in which girls demonstrated loss of voice (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Hammer & Lyons, 1990). For example, the theme of care as self-silencing has been reported by girls in the prior qualitative studies who describe a willingness to deny their own needs states in order to keep social relationships running smoothly. Likewise, the girls in these qualitative studies report judging themselves by external social standards of "goodness" by which they silence expression of true feelings for fear of damaging or losing important relationships. Further, in their silencing, many of the girls in these prior studies made reference to a "divided self" which experienced conflict between accommodating self needs versus others' needs.

The STSS was adapted for our younger population by substituting the word "best friend" or "close friend" for

the original wording of "intimate relationship" or "partner." Cronbach alpha's on the STSS range from .86-.94 (Jack & Dill, 1992). The modified version adapted for our adolescent population yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .84.

The original 31-item scale yields a total self-silencing score which can range from 31-155, with high scores indicating more self silencing. Individual items were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree." Items from the STSS with modifications underlined are shown in Appendix A.

Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ). The quality of the participant's friendships was assessed using the Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ), a scale designed to assess children's perceptions of various qualitative aspects of their friendships. The FQQ was derived from a questionnaire developed by Buhrmester & Furman (1987) in their study of the development of childhood companionship and intimacy. According to the authors, the FQQ evolved over two administrations to 278 third-through sixth-grade children and 153 third-through fifth-grade children. Weak or ambiguous items were discarded, yielding the current

measure, containing 40 items. Following the protocol of this scale, participants were asked to rate items according to a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from "not at all true" (0), to "really true" (4). High scores on the FQQ indicate more of the measured friendship quality, such as Intimate Exchange.

The FQQ subscales provide six indices of friendship quality: Intimate Exchange, Conflict Resolution, Companionship and Recreation, Help and Guidance, Validation and Caring, and Conflict and Betrayal (an inverse measure), with Cronbach alpha's for each subscale reported at .86, .73, .75, .90, .90 and .84, respectively (Parker & Asher, 1993). The current administration yielded slightly lower alpha's of .85, .60, .70, .84, .82 and .76, respectively. All FQQ items and their subscale groupings and alphas are listed in Appendix B. Means, standard deviations and ranges for each scale, adjusted and divided by the number of items in each scale, are shown in Table 2 of the results section.

Friendship Participation. Participants were also asked to check from a list as to whether they currently have: a "close friend or "best friend," two or more "close friends"

or "best friends," a "friend," "some friends," or "classmates, but not friends" (see Appendix C).

Friendship Importance. Friendship importance was assessed using two items from Harter's (1985) Self Perception Profile for Children (SPPC), both designed to assess the importance of social acceptance, through participants' estimation of the value they place on both having lots of friends and being popular (see Appendix D). Harter's measure of social acceptance is a subscale of a larger instrument designed to measure both competence and importance of behavior across several domains. This measure incorporates a method of response selection that addresses problems which may occur because of social desirability. In each item, two contrasting statements are juxtaposed, and participants are asked to pick from one of the two statements framed as normal for "some kids." From this dichotomy, participants choose first the side or statement and then the item which best captures what is "really true of me" or "sort of true of me." Friendship importance scores were obtained by recoding reversed items and summing the scores on both scales. This procedure yielded friendship

importance scores ranging from 1-8, with 8 indicating a high level of importance attached to having friends.

Self-Orientation. The final items consisted of a sentence completion task where participants were asked to list words they would use to describe themselves. Participants were given sentence stems with the instructions; "Five words that I would use to describe myself are".... followed by five fill-in blanks (see Appendix E).

These five fill-in items were used as a modified version of the Twenty Statements Test (TST, Kuhn & Parker, 1954). In the original version of the TST, which was designed to measure self-structure, participants complete 20 statements, beginning with the words "I am. . .". Bochner (1994) suggests that the use of twenty questions is "about 13 too many," citing problems with diminishing returns and redundancy which occur when participants are asked to complete this many sentences. In light of this criticism, the youth of our sample, and the length of our survey, the measure was modified to solicit 5 words from which we could assess participant's self-orientation. The words generated

by the participants were listed and presented to two judges (a male and a female graduate student), both blind to the purpose of the study. The words were assigned by these raters into one of three categories according to definitions provided by Bochner (see Appendix F). Bochner's descriptions described criteria for independent, group orientated, and relational self-orientations. Inter-rater reliability was .91 and in cases where the student ratings did not agree, the author's ratings were included and agreement of two out of three raters determined category placement.

Also, following Bochner's (1994) methodology, a weighting of responses was used. Bochner states that, when people are asked to describe themselves, it is "highly likely that they will mention first those attributes that they regard as important" (p.276). Consistent with this, each participant received a weighted score for each category of self-orientation according to the order in which it appeared on the page. Therefore, the first word recorded received a score of 5 and was tallied as either an independent, group or relational self-orientation. In a like manner, the second descriptor recorded got a score of 4 and was tallied in its appropriate category. The third

descriptor got a score of 3, the fourth a 2, and the fifth, a 1. All of these scores were then summed within categories to provide each participant a score for each of the three self-orientation categories. Scores in each category could range from 0 to High scores indicated more use of words and/or primacy of position of words describing self-orientation (see Appendix G for examples of scoring).

Procedure

Permission for classroom survey administration was first obtained from school administrators and teachers, then letters of informed consent were sent home to students' parents one week prior to data collection in classrooms (see Appendix H). Only students returning letters with signed informed consent were allowed to participate in the study.

The survey was group administered in classrooms by the researcher. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation and were told not to put their names on their surveys. Further, they were informed that they could decline to participate at any time without penalty. In sum, participants were treated in accordance

with the guidelines of conduct for researchers and participants and according to American Psychological Association standards (APA, 1992).

Students' seating was arranged so respondents were not sitting next to their friends or best friends. Initially, participants were guided through use of a Likert type scale by an exercise in rating school activities and hobbies using the response choice format contained in the survey. Participants were then instructed to answer all questions in the survey in reference to a "best friend" or "close friend" they currently had. Students were instructed to answer the questions as honestly as possible and were told that there were no "right" and "wrong" answers.

Each question was read aloud by the administrator to ensure that items were not skipped. In addition to the measures previously discussed, students were asked to answer demographic questions for age, grade, gender, and ethnicity (see Appendix I). The questionnaires took approximately 40 minutes to complete.

Participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation (see Appendix J). They were told that what was

measured was their experience of "self" and how they felt and acted in their friendships and relationships. The students were then encouraged to talk to their parents, teachers, or school guidance counselor, if there were any questions or issues in the survey that had made them feel uncomfortable. Participants were told how to reach the researcher for results of the study. Finally, participants were told that their participation would help social scientists understand more about both "self" and friendship in adolescent development.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Because Jack's (1992) development of the Silencing the Self Scale (STSS) and subsequent subscales was based on scores derived from studies of adult women, the STSS was subjected to principal components analysis to investigate the underlying structure based on our male and female adolescent sample. Varimax rotation and mean substitution for missing data were used in analyzing the responses of our 366 participants. Based both on inspection of the scree plot and on Jack's original factor structure, a four factor solution was chosen, accounting for 38.1% of the variance. The four factors of adolescent self-silencing were labeled "Silencing feelings," "Unselfish Imperative," "Negative Externalized Self," and "False Self." These factors were similar in content to Jack's original subscales (see Appendix A). Items, loadings, eigenvalues and alpha coefficients are provided in Table 1. Both total scores on STSS, and scores from factor subscales derived from this sample were used in subsequent analyses. Means, standard

Table 1

Items and Factor Loadings, Modified Silencing the Self Scale

Factor 1: Silencing Feelings	F1	F2	F3	F4
*15. I speak my feelings with my close friend, even when it leads to problems or disagreements.	.69	-.06	-.91	.00
26. I think it is better to keep my feelings to myself when they conflict with my close friends.	.63	.18	.05	.19
2. I don't speak my feelings in a close friendship when I know they will cause disagreement.	.56	.17	.00	.22
24. I rarely express my anger at those close to me.	.50	.20	.09	.12
14. Instead of risking disagreements in close relationships, I would rather not rock the boat.	.49	.18	.16	.06
*8. When my close friend's needs and feelings conflict with my own, I always state mine clearly.	.48	.07	.09	-.03
30. I try to bury my feelings when I think they will cause trouble in my close relationships.	.45	.23	.21	.34

(table continues)

Note. * Indicates reversed items. Factor 1 Chronbach's alpha = .72, Eigenvalue = 6.13.

Factor 2: Unselfish Imperative	F1	F2	F3	F4
22. Doing things for myself is selfish.	.18	.63	-.13	.15
4. Considering my needs to be as important as those of people I love is selfish.	.09	.60	-.12	.12
9. In a close friendship it is my responsibility to make the other person happy.	.08	.56	.27	.02
10. Caring means choosing to do what the other wants, even when I want to do something different.	.09	.56	.27	.01
29. In a close friendship, I don't care what we do, as long as the other person is happy.	.24	.53	.23	-.05
3. Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own.	-.01	.51	.07	-.09
12. One of the worst things I can do is be selfish.	.09	.42	.21	-.24

(table continues)

Factor 2: Unselfish Imperative	F1	F2	F3	F4
18. When my close friend's needs or opinions conflict with mine, rather than asserting my point of view, I usually end up agreeing with him/her.	.37	.42	.25	.18
23. When I make decisions, other people's thoughts and decisions influence me more than my own thoughts and opinions.	.26	.37	.36	.16
20. When it looks as though certain of my needs won't be met in a friendship, I realize that they weren't very important anyway.	.16	.36	.01	.36

Note. Factor 2 Chronbach's alpha = .74, Eigenvalue = 2.38.

Factor 3: Negative Externalized Self	F1	F2	F3	F4
7. I feel unhappy with myself because I feel I should be able to do all the things kids are able to do these days.	.07	.05	.58	.24

(table continues)

Factor 3: Negative Externalized Self	F1	F2	F3	F4
28. I find it hard to know what I think and feel because I spend a lot of time thinking about how other people are feeling.	.02	.35	.56	.10
31. I never seem to stand up to the measures I set for myself.	.04	.06	.56	.30
6. I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me.	.31	-.06	.54	-.02
11. In order to feel good about myself, I need to be able to please others.	.29	.18	.53	-.08
27. I often feel responsible for other peoples feelings.	-.03	.27	.53	-.12
16. Often I look happy enough on the outside, but inwardly I feel angry and rebellious.	.16	-.02	.47	.27

Note. Factor 3 Chronbach's alpha = .67, Eigenvalue = 1.93.

(table continues)

Factor 4: False Self	F1	F2	F3	F4
25. I feel that my close friend does not know my real self.	.09	.01	.04	.72
19. When I am in a close friendship, I lose my sense of who I am.	.15	.14	.25	.55
*1. I think it is best to put myself first because no one else will look out for me.	.14	-.04	.02	-.51
17. In order for my close friend to like me, I cannot reveal certain things about myself.	.33	-.01	.19	.50
13. I feel I have to act in a certain way to please my friend.	.40	-.11	.42	.46
5. I find it harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship, then when I am on my own.	.20	.10	.33	.37

Note. * indicates reversed items. Factor 4 Chronbach's
alpha = .62, Eigenvalue = 1.37.

deviations and ranges for all variables included in the study are presented in Table 2. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

Self-Silencing/Loss of Voice

To test the first two hypotheses regarding developmental and gender differences in self-silencing, a 2(gender) X 3(age) between-subjects ANOVA was run using total STSS scores as the DV. This analysis revealed that girls' self-silencing scores were lower ($M = 81.38$, $SD = 17.08$) than boys ($M = 83.95$, $SD = 15.30$), but the differences were not statistically significant, $F(1, 341) = 1.87$, $p = .17$. Further, this analysis failed to support the hypothesized main effect for age, $F(2, 341) = .09$, $p = .93$, nor was the interaction between age and gender statistically significant, $F(2, 341) = 2.68$, $p = .07$.

A 2(gender) X 3(age) between-subjects MANOVA was then performed using the STSS factors derived from our sample as the DVs: Silencing Feelings, Unselfish Imperative, Negative Externalized Self and False Self. Using the Pillais criterion (Kelly, 1996), the combined DVs were significantly affected by gender, $F(4, 338) = 7.65$, $p = .00$, yielding a moderate multivariate effect size ($\omega^2 = .08$). However, the DV's were not affected by a main effect of age, $F(8, 678) =$

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics on all Measures

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Range
Self-Silencing/Loss of Voice Measures				
Total STSS	349	103.7	5.45	31-155
STSS Factors				
Silencing Feelings	360	2.64	.75	1-5
Unselfish Imperative	361	2.84	.67	1-5
Negative Externalized Self	363	2.97	.78	1-5
False Self	363	1.75	.54	1-5
Friendship Quality Measures				
Companionship and Recreation	358	2.79	.95	0-4
Validation and Caring	357	2.63	.68	0-4
Help and Guidance	353	2.40	.72	0-4
Intimate Exchange	362	2.63	1.05	0-4
Conflict Resolution	358	2.53	1.07	0-4
Conflict and Betrayal	363	.81	.71	0-4
Friendship Importance	367	2.70	1.04	1-8
Self-Orientation Measures				
Independent	361	6.70	4.07	0-15
Group	361	.89	2.17	0-15
Relational	361	7.22	4.28	0-15

1.35, $p = .21$, nor was the gender by age interaction statistically significant, $F(8, 678) = 1.23$, $p = .28$.

Inspection of univariate F tests of gender revealed that significant effects of gender were found in the factors labeled Unselfish Imperative, $F(1, 341) = 4.73$, $p = .03$, Negative Externalized Self, $F(1, 341) = 4.86$, $p = .03$, and False self, $F(1, 347) = 7.36$, $p = .00$, but these effect sizes were small ($\omega^2 = .01$, $.01$ and $.02$ respectively). Boys ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .66$; $M = 1.88$, $SD = .53$) were more silent than than girls ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .67$; $M = 1.69$, $SD = .50$) on STSS factors Unselfish Imperative and False Self. However, on the STSS factor Negative Externalized Self, girls ($M = 3.03$, $SD = .85$) were significantly more self-silencing than boys ($M = 2.87$, $SD = .71$). The remaining factor, Silencing Feelings, was not significantly different for girls and boys, $F(1, 347) = 1.72$, $p = .19$.

Friendship Importance

To test hypothesis three, that self-silencing and loss of voice would be positively related to ratings of importance of friendship, Pearson product-moment

correlations were run using total STSS scores and the four STSS subscale factors. This hypothesis was supported by significant but weak positive relationships in all but one silencing factor. The significant correlations with friendship importance were as follows: Total STSS scores, $r = .14$, $p = .01$, Silencing Feelings, $r = .13$, $p = .01$, Externalized Negative Self, $r = .12$, $p = .02$, False Self, $r = .12$, $p = .03$. Unselfish Imperative was not related to friendship importance, $r = .08$, $p = .12$.

Friendship Participation

To test hypothesis four, friendship participation's effect on self-silencing, friendship participation ratings were dichotomized into two groups: those who had close friends or best friends, and those with "just friends" or acquaintances. An independent t test was run between these groups to ascertain whether those who reported being involved in close friendships would be more self-silencing than those without close friends. There was a significant difference between groups, $t(33.63) = -2.73$, $p = .01$; however, the relationship was in the opposite direction as hypothesized. Those who reported having "friends," but not close friends

($M = 89.66$, $SD = 16.25$) were significantly more self-silencing than participants with a close friend or best friend or two or more close friends or best friends ($M = 81.43$, $SD = 16.34$).

Friendship Quality

Predicted negative relationships between self-silencing and interactive and supportive friendship qualities (Intimate Exchange, Validation and Caring, and Conflict Resolution) were examined using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. In addition, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were run between all measures of friendship quality and both the overall self-silencing scores, as well as the four self-silencing factors. Correlational analyses revealed that all measures of friendship quality held significant relationships with total self-silencing scores. In addition, two of the STSS subscale factors, Silencing Feelings and False Self, revealed significant relationships with all of the friendship quality measures. Positive or supportive friendship qualities (Companionship and Recreation, Validation and Caring, Help and Guidance, Conflict

Resolution, and Intimate Exchange) held negative relationships with self-silencing scores. Consistent with this, Conflict and Betrayal, an inverse measure of friendship quality, was significantly and positively related to self-silencing using STSS factors and STSS total scores. The remaining correlations between the five supportive friendship quality measures and two silencing factors, Unselfish Imperative and Externalized Negative Self Assessment, were not significant (see Table 3).

Self-Orientation Differences

Self-Orientation scores were obtained for each participant in each of the three self-orientation categories measuring Independent, Relational, and Group Orientations. Means for the sample were as follows; Independent ($M = 6.7$, $SD = 4.4$), Relational ($M = 7.2$, $SD = 4.2$), and Group ($M = 2.1$, $SD = .90$).

Next, a 2(gender) x 3(age) between-subjects MANOVA was performed using the three measures of self-orientation as DV's to test the hypothesis regarding gender differences in self-orientation as well as to explore possible age differences in self-orientation. Multivariate analysis using

Table 3

Correlations between Friendship Quality Measures and
Measures of Self-Silencing

Variables	STSS	F1	F2	F3	F4
Companionship and Recreation	-.14**	-.12*	.09	-.07	-.13*
Validation and Caring	-.23***	-.25***	-.09	-.06	-.37***
Help and Guidance	-.16**	-.18**	-.08	.01	-.28***
Intimate Exchange	-.20***	-.28***	-.08	.05	-.37***
Conflict Resolution	.13*	-.18**	-.03	-.00	-.28***
Conflict and Betrayal	.21***	.11*	.13*	.18***	.35***

Note. STSS = total self-silencing scores, F1 = Silencing
Feelings, F2 = Unselfish Imperative, F3 = Negative
Externalized Self, F4 = False Self.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

the Pillais criterion revealed that the combined DV's measuring self-orientation were significantly affected by gender, $F(3, 351) = 10.97$, $p = .00$, yielding a moderate multivariate effect size of .09. As predicted, inspection of univariate F tests and means revealed that boys ($M = 7.70$, $SD = 4.13$) had significantly higher Independent Orientation scores than girls ($M = 6.13$, $SD = 3.93$), $F(1, 353) = 12.41$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .03$. Boys also had significantly higher scores on Group Orientations ($M = 1.32$, $SD = 1.21$) than girls ($M = .65$, $SD = 1.79$), $F(1, 353) = 4.68$, $p = .03$, but the effect was small ($\omega^2 = .01$). The hypothesis that girls ($M = 8.1$, $SD = 3.92$) would use significantly more relational words than boys ($M = 5.6$, $SD = 4.42$) was supported, $F(1, 353) = 26.95$, $p = .00$, yielding a medium effect, $\omega^2 = .07$ (see Table 4).

While no prediction was offered regarding age differences in self-orientation, the combined DV's were significantly affected by age $F(6, 704) = 2.68$, $p = .01$, but the overall effect size was small $\omega^2 = .02$. Inspection of univariate F tests revealed significant differences in age for the measure of Group Orientation, $F(2, 353) = 7.90$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .04$. Between group differences were assessed using

Table 4

Gender Differences, Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Orientation

Orientation	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	F ratio
	<u>M</u> (<u>SD</u>)	<u>M</u> (<u>SD</u>)	
Independent	7.70 (4.16)	6.11 (3.93)	13.2***
Group	1.32 (2.30)	.65 (1.79)	8.09*
Relational	5.60 (4.43)	8.15 (3.92)	32.23***

Note: The higher the score, the greater the strength of the orientation.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Tukey's HSD test and results revealed a significant difference between the youngest group (12-14 years, $M = 1.45$, $SD = 2.9$) and the oldest group (16-18 years, $M = .34$, $SD = 1.14$). The oldest students had significantly lower scores of Group Orientation than the youngest group of students. Finally, the combined DV's were not significantly

affected by an interaction between age and gender, $F(6, 704) = .96, p = .45$.

Self-Orientation and Self-Silencing

Pearson product-moment correlations were run to test hypothesis seven, a predicted positive relationship between Relational Orientation and self-silencing. When assessed using total STSS scores, no significant relationship was found, $r = -.08, p = .14$. Using STSS factors, a significant negative relationship was found only with the False Self factor, $r = -.17, p = .00$.

Next, hypothesis eight was tested which predicted a significant negative relationship between Independent Orientation and self-silencing. Using total STSS scores this relationship was not found, $r = -.04, p = .49$. Again, STSS subscale factors were assessed for relationships with Independent Orientation and again, only the False Self factor yielded a significant relationship and in the opposite direction than predicted, $r = .13, p = .01$. All of the assessed relationships between self-orientation, self-silencing and the four STSS subscale factors are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Correlations between Self-Orientation and Self-Silencing Scores

Orientation	Total STSS	SF	UI	NES	FS
Independent	.04	.07	-.06	.09	.13*
Group	-.08	-.10	.01	-.08	-.17**
Relational	.09	.06	.07	.03	-.06

Note. SF = Silencing Feelings, UI = Unselfish Imperative, NES = Negative Externalized Self, FS = False Self.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

DISCUSSION

Loss of Voice

The first hypothesis that girls demonstrate more self-silencing/loss of voice than boys was not supported by the overall measure of self-silencing (total STSS scores). However, analysis by STSS subscale factors yielded mixed results --on one subscale girls were more self-silencing than boys, and on two others, boys were more self-silencing than girls. While the overall effect size of gender was important, the effect sizes for the factor x gender differences were quite small.

Negative Externalized Self. The hypothesis that girls demonstrate more self-silencing than boys was supported by one self-silencing/loss of voice factor, Negative Externalized Self. The Negative Externalized Self factor captures an affective component of self-silencing, reflecting both dissatisfaction with self and an externalized self-concept. A person with an externalized self concept derives self worth through his or her ability to please others. Thus the Negative Externalized Self factor captures a personal angst reflecting an unhappy divided

self, a person felt judged by others, who tries to please others, feels ineffective, confused, unhappy and angry.

It is interesting that girls scored significantly higher than boys on this factor, as the affects and cognitions captured in the Negative Externalized Self factor are typical of the constellation of feelings and thoughts women are said to internalize as a result of living in an oppressive social milieu (Gilligan, 1982; Jack, 1991; Miller, 1976). This factor may capture the psychological condition some feminist authors claim is induced by upholding women's traditional roles in a culture that devalues women and things feminine (e.g., Cowan, Bommersbach, & Curtis, 1995; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1986; Ritter, 1993).

Also, the cognitions, affects and traits assessed by the Negative Externalized Self factor overlap with many cognitions, affects and traits associated with depression in women. For example, depending on the evaluations of others to gain self worth (externalization of self) has been associated with depression in women (Gurian, 1987), and may predispose one to experience learned helplessness,

another behavioral manifestation of depression (Seligman, 1975). In addition, those with an externalized self-concept may feel responsible for others' feelings, invoking the social support stressor "contagion of stress," where personal stress is increased by bearing the weight of others' distress (Thoits, 1983). Related to externalized self-concept and also loading on this factor is high interpersonal responsibility, a trait found more often in women than men, and also a correlate of depression (Haussman & Halseth, 1987; McGrath et al., 1991; Ritter, 1993). Items loading on this factor reflect other constructs associated with depression: confusion, lack of efficacy, and feelings of unhappiness and anger (McGrath et al., 1991). Thus, the Negative Externalized Self factor may be seen as a measure of depressive symptom correlates. As such, the significantly higher scores girls demonstrate compared to boys is not surprising, as beginning in adolescence, the depression rate for women is double that of men (Noel-Hoeksema, 1987; Nolen-Hoeksema & Girgus, 1994; Weissman & Klerman, 1977).

While findings from the Negative Externalized Self factor support the first hypothesis, findings from two out of the four STSS subscale factors contradict this hypothesis. On the Unselfish Imperative and False Self factors, boys demonstrated significantly more self-silencing than girls. Though unpredicted, these findings are consistent with recently published studies of self-silencing using adult samples. In these studies, researchers found no gender differences on total STSS scores (Cowan et al., 1995) and in two studies, more silencing among men than women (Gratch, Bassett & Attra, 1995; Thompson, 1995). These findings are curious as the STSS was normed on women, and was designed to measure self-silencing schemas employed by women to maintain harmony in relationship. Interestingly, in this study and in other studies using adults, the measure seems sensitive to male experience, demonstrating that both women and men self-silence in their relationships, but perhaps for different reasons (Gratch et al., 1995). Indeed, analysis of gender differences in self-silencing using factors derived from our sample strongly suggest that males

and females self-silence for different reasons or around different themes.

Unselfish Imperative. Just as the result of girl's increased silencing on the Negative Externalized Self factor can be interpreted as reflecting gendered social messages which influence women in our culture, boys' higher self-silencing scores on the Unselfish Imperative factor can be seen as reflecting socialization messages directed at boys and men. Items from the Unselfish Imperative factor describe behaviors one engages in when interacting with others to avoid being labeled selfish. Feminist analysis of gender role socialization has amply documented and criticized the process by which women are socialized to be unselfish and self-sacrificing, particularly in their roles as caretakers (Miller, 1986; Kaplan et al., 1991). However, writers in the anti-sexist men's movement also describe men's socialization toward self-sacrifice (Farrell, 1986). According to Farrell, men are socialized toward self-sacrifice to fulfill their role as "providers" (Farrell, 1986). Even though boys are socialized toward increasing autonomy, independence and freedom, and are encouraged "to be one's own man" (Levinson,

1978), our data suggests that boys also respond to a social imperative not to act too selfishly.

However, given what has been written about boys' and girls' similar socialization process around selfish behavior, it is interesting that girls in our sample did not demonstrate a drive to be unselfish at least as high, if not higher than boys. It might be that boys report more silencing than girls on the Unselfish Imperative factor because it is largely a behavioral measure, more of a list of things one does as opposed to what one thinks and feels. For example, a sample STSS item reads "Caring means choosing to do what the other wants, even when I want to do something different." In contrast, the Negative Externalized factor contains more statements reflecting affect and cognitions. Because boys are taught to emphasize agentic aspects of being over affective states (Jordan, 1991), the Unselfish Imperative may be a more sensitive measure for boys than girls in that it emphasizes behaviors.

The results from the Unselfish Imperative factor may, in addition, be capturing developmental differences in the salience for boys and girls of the imperative to act

unselfishly. It could be argued that at this time in development, the message to not behave selfishly becomes more central to boys, as they strive to integrate autonomy with the ability to form intimate relationships (Erikson, 1950). In contrast, and according to relational theory, girls at this time may be quite proficient in their orientation toward others and in their ability to behave unselfishly (Jordan, et al., 1991). A concern more central to girls may be the integration and expression of self needs when they conflict with the needs of others (Brown, 1991b). A final interpretation to consider regarding these results involves problems with the transparency of the measure and issues of social desirability. It may be the case that girls reading items in the STSS are aware that the psychologically "healthy response" for girls is one that doesn't make them sound overly self-sacrificing, or like "door mats." Conversely, boys, aware of their entitlement and responding to the tension between developing an autonomous self and a "sensitive self," may find it more socially desirable to say that they avoid behaving selfishly. It is very likely that what was actually measured was what boys felt they should be

doing and the way in which girls would really like to appear. Controlling for social desirability in future studies using the STSS may help rule out problems with this confound.

The implications of boys' linking care with self sacrifice is interesting. If for boys, caring for others and being in relationship entails self-sacrifice, then being in a relationship itself may be seen as burdensome and in conflict with self interests. In contrast, according to relational theory, women's experience of relationship centers around an expectation of intersubjective mutuality, intimacy, and self-growth through interaction. Put simply, women may have an expectation to gain something through relationship, while men may expect to have to give something up. As such, the notion of relationship could hold very different meanings and expectations for men and for women. Indeed, it is these very problems of varying relational expectations which resonate for readers of popular psychological literature such as Gray's Men are from Mars, Women from Venus. The findings on the Unselfish Imperative factor may reflect differing attitudes towards both

relationship and self sacrifice, which may have important implications in the maintenance of relationships, especially in terms of gains and sacrifice.

False Self. The second reverse finding of the girls' silencing hypothesis occurred on the False Self Factor, where boys scored significantly higher than girls. This contradicts psychoanalytic theory, which holds that the creation of a false or inauthentic self is a defense strategy (Horney, 1937); a defense interpreted by Weskott (1997) as a way of socializing girls to become objects of others' desires and pleasure, and by Brown (1991b) as a feature of girls development which protects them from violating gender norms of goodness (Brown, 1991b).

The work of these theorists lead us to expect girls to score at least as high as boys on the False Self factor. However, these unpredicted findings might be explained again by examining male gender role socialization. High scores for boys, indicating the creation of a false self, may be due to strong socialization messages aimed at boys which discourage them from being authentic and expressive emotionally (Kimmel, 1993; Pleck, 1974). Boys and men and

are instead taught to behave like "sturdy oaks" (Kimmel, 1993, p.123), to mute feelings and any expressions of vulnerability. It may be that the silencing in the False Self factor captures the interpersonal limitations of an individualistic, autonomous world view. Items contained in the False Self factor tap the respondent's ability to both feel "real" and express "real" selves in relationship. Participants with high scores on this factor may be aware of a "real" idiographic self which is fearful of exposure and must be hidden from others in relationship. The social demands on boys to not express vulnerability may provide the impetus for the creation of a false self. The findings from analysis of this factor support the idea that the impenetrable, autonomous, independent self which is encouraged to develop in boys may lead to the creation of a division in boys between true selves and fictitious selves (Miller, 1976; Sampson, 1991).

A contrasting view of self, explained by relational theory, sees the self as constructed in the interplay of a relationships. The relational self is more complex and fluid in construction than the autonomous self. It may be

the case that girls begin earlier than boys to integrate "opposing" selves, and thus actually feel less split and false in relationships. The significant gender differences found on the False Self factor may simply reflect different cultural norms for the expression of relational and autonomous selves in gender role development (Kimmel, 1993). Such differences may help explain the difficulty boys have being real and expressive in their interpersonal relationships, particularly in the area of intimacy, as compared with girls (Crockett, Losoff, & Peterson, 1984; Sharanaby, Gershoni & Hofman, 1981).

Silencing Feelings. The final factor, Silencing Feelings, yielded no gender differences. While the previously discussed "masculine imperative" to avoid expressiveness and acknowledgment of feeling states leads us to expect that boys would show more silencing than girls on this factor, one must remember that girls are also socialized to avoid showing certain feelings, in particular the feeling of anger (Miller, 1976; Tavris, 1989; Thomas, 1993). Some of the items included in the Silencing Feelings factor measure one's ability to express negative feelings

such as anger in relationships. While men have been socialized to silence around the majority of their affective states, particularly ones which make them appear weak and vulnerable, anger is one affective state, in American culture, that boys are subtly encouraged to express (Averill, 1982; Miller, 1991). While for both genders, anger tends to be destructive to relationships, boys are apparently freer to express anger due to such socialization processes (Miller, 1991; Tavris, 1991). Because of boys' socialized difficulty in expressing feelings in general, and girls' socialized reluctance to express anger, we would expect that both girls and boys silence some feelings. Future research needs to address precisely which feelings girls and boys silence, and for what reasons.

Summary and Critique of Loss of Voice Findings. In sum, both boys and girls self-silence, but they silence around different themes contained in the STSS. It is apparent that these gender differences in themes cancel out overall predicted gender differences in total STSS scores. A further explanation for these negative results may be problems with operationalization of "loss of voice" on the

STSS. There are several possible problems with the use of the STSS to measure "loss of voice."

First, because the STSS was constructed and normed for use in clinical populations, and specifically used as a correlate of depression among women, it may be the case that the items reflect a self-suppression so extreme, and so related to depression, that it may not reflect the adolescent self-silencing occurring in non-depressed groups. Second, items in the STSS were created to assess silencing occurring in adult intimate relationships. The silencing that occurs in adolescent friendships may not be qualitatively equivalent to that which occurs in adult marital and cohabiting relationships.

Finally, the greatest problem in measuring "loss of voice" results from the lack of a concise operational definition of the construct. The STSS may be an instrument tapping something similar to loss of voice, or it may be measuring only a narrow piece of the loss of voice domain. Behavioral observations of girls' actual interactions in relationship may be needed to more fully understand and investigate "loss of voice."

A further methodological problem affecting our results may be dissimilarity between this sample and samples used in the prior qualitative studies (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Lyons and Hamner, 1990). The sample of West coast girls attending co-educational public schools may be qualitatively different from samples from earlier studies. The West coast girls may be more willing to say they are selfish and less self-silencing, or they may actually be more selfish and less self-silencing than girls from private schools in the East and Midwest. In addition, the current sample was made up of a combination of poor, working and middle class girls. It may be that this sample is unlike Gilligan's samples and more similar to the sample of racially mixed, poor, urban girls studied by Way (1995). In Way's sample of urban, disadvantaged girls, the girls demonstrated both "outspokenness" and an overall ease in speaking their feelings (Way, 1995, p. 107). Ensuring that the research sample more closely matched Gilligan's original sample would help rule out the confound of existing differences between groups.

The second hypothesis, that girls would demonstrate increased self-silencing with age, was not supported by any of the measures of self-silencing. This may indicate that there are no developmental shifts in adolescent silencing, or it may indicate that the measure was not able to pick up developmental shifts described in prior research. It is also possible that the girls sampled here were too old to demonstrate the shift that occurs from girlhood to adolescence. Initially, the study was planned to include fifth through tenth grade students, but a pilot study using the modified STSS with fifth grade students revealed that the wording of the STSS was too abstract and sophisticated for this younger population. Future studies including a younger range of students and a measure suitable for younger students, such as behavioral observations, are needed to determine whether this study missed the developmental shift said to occur in girls.

Friendship Importance

The third hypothesis, suggesting a tie between friendship importance and self-silencing was supported. Inspection of total STSS scores showed that students

silenced more if they held friendships important, and this finding held for three subscale factors; Silencing Feelings, Externalized Negative Self, and False Self. These results are consistent with analyses of interview data which suggest that self-silencing is linked to the desire to maintain a connection to others (Jack, 1991; Brown & Gilligan, 1991).

Two of the self-silencing factors, False Self and Silencing Feelings, contain items specifically related to one's sensitivity to voice's impact on relationship. High scores on the False Self factor suggest that only certain aspects of self may be revealed to others in one's connections with others. Likewise, the Silencing Feelings factor reflects a fear of repercussions if one's feelings are expressed in relationship. The third factor, Negative Externalized Self, can be seen as linked to friendship importance through items which tap one's externalized self image and need to please others.

The fourth factor, Unselfish Imperative, was not related to friendship importance. It may be the case that the self-silencing captured in this factor is more reflective of a moral obligation to not act selfishly,

making this factor less personally relational than the other three factors. In sum, our results concerning relationship importance support Gilligan et al.'s observations that self-silencing occurs in deference to voice's impact on important relationships. Lack of gender differences in these findings indicate that the connection between relationship importance and self-silencing, made by studying girls (Brown & Gilligan, 1990) may also generalize to boys.

Friendship Participation

Interestingly, the next hypothesis, which predicted that those who participated in close friendships would be more self-silencing than those without close friends was not supported. Those with just "friends," not close friends, were the most self-silencing of the students studied. However, it could be the case that students' experience of self-silencing actually keeps them from having and developing friends. Clearly, voice is an important vehicle for establishing and maintaining relationship (Gilligan, 1982; Surrey, 1991). Gilligan (1994) claims, without voice, there can be no connection. Although loss of voice and

silencing may be used to keep relationships intact, initial self-silencing may impede the development of relationships.

Friendship Quality

The fifth hypothesis, that friendship qualities emphasizing mutual sharing and understanding are positively related to evidence of voice in relationship was supported. This significant relationship was found using total STSS scores and additionally in the Silencing Feelings and False Self factors. These findings are not surprising, as the Silencing Feelings and False Self factors contain items which capture silencing used to keep relationships intact and running smoothly.

In contrast, the items combined to make up the other two factors, Unselfish Imperative and Negative Externalized Self, imply different motives for silencing. The Negative Externalized Self factor reflects silencing occurring around feelings of disgruntlement and low self worth. The Unselfish Imperative reflects silencing which occurs due to the directive to put others first. It is perhaps because the silencing tapped by these latter two factors is more generalized and less specifically dyadic that the

relationship between friendship quality and voice did not hold.

Self-Orientation and Gender

Hypotheses six and seven, that girls are more relational and boys more independent in their orientations, as suggested by relational theory (Jordan et al., 1991), were supported. Girls demonstrated significantly higher relational self-orientations than boys, and boys demonstrated significantly higher independent self-orientation scores than girls. These findings are consistent with the analysis of the play and game patterns of girls and boys, where girls more than boys have been found to engage in games in cooperative ways, especially avoiding the elimination of others and a single winner (Block, 1984).

The finding that boys had more group self-orientations than girls supports a distinction found between group identity and relational identity found in recent research (Kashima et al., 1995). The data revealed that the majority of the identities falling into the group orientation category revolved around sports and recreational activities, rather than family, church or ethnic and cultural groups.

The finding that more boys than girls reflected this group orientation (i.e., being a surfer, or a football player), may reflect differences in self identity informed by differences in play patterns, where boys tend to play in larger groups than girls, whose interactions are more dyadic (Gilligan, 1982). The finding that boys used more group orientated descriptors suggests a salience sports and group activity holds for boys' developing identities (Block, 1984).

Self-Orientation's Relationship with Self-Silencing

The eighth hypothesis, suggesting a positive relationship between relational self-orientation and self-silencing was not supported. This findings is similar to the relationship observed between voice and friendship participation. It may be that while being in a relationship or being relational may invoke a need for some self-silencing/loss of voice, being relational or participating in relationships more likely creates a vehicle by which self and voice are strengthened. Therefore, having a relational self-orientation may actually create somewhat of a buffer against self-silencing.

Hypotheses nine, that group self-orientation would be related to loss of voice was also not supported. In fact, for one factor of Self-Silencing, False Self, the inverse of this hypothesis was true. This finding suggests that having a group-orientated self-concept may facilitate an adolescent's ability to be more authentic, real, and to use voice in relationship. Being connected to others through a group identity, at least in American culture, interestingly does not seem to be linked to diminishment of self's expression through voice.

Finally, the predicted negative relationship between independent self-orientation and self-silencing was not found, indicating that independent self-orientation is not related to greater expressions of voice. Of all the factors tested, only the False Self factor yielded a significant relationship with self-silencing, and this relationship was in the opposite direction than predicted. This weak significant relationship suggests that the more one construes self as separate, idiographic and autonomous, the more one may be prone to self-silence by displaying a false self. This finding lends some support to the assertion that

pursuit of the truly individuated independent self can lead to self-alienation (Cushman, 1993; Sampson, 1991).

In summary, style of self-orientation does not seem to strongly be related to voice's strength or absence. Being relational or other-oriented, much discussed in qualitative research, does not appear to be associated with self-silencing. A more important factor involved in self-silencing may be the nature of the relationship, rather than the nature of the parties involved in the relationship. Future research should further explore these contextual factors which may contribute to self-silencing.

Summary of Findings

Overall, this study did not find overwhelming evidence for loss of voice occurring in female adolescence. Girls showed more silencing around a negative externalized self-image factor, which seemed to reflect depressive symptom correlates. Boys reported more self-silencing than girls around care-taking and false self themes. Together these results seem to indicate that both girls and boys self-silence, and that self-silencing merits further exploration as part of both male and female adolescent experience.

Results from this data do support some of relational theory's assertions about girls' development. Girls were more relational in their orientations compared with boys and boys more independently oriented compared with girls. Being relational was not associated with loss of voice, but it may be that independent self-orientations, seen more in boys, may lead to loss of voice and the creation of a false self.

Certain of these results suggest that the "crisis" of adolescent development may turn out to be an opposite dilemma for girls and boys. Girls, who are more relationally attuned and interpersonally skilled (Sharanby, et al., 1981), may have more difficulty negotiating autonomy without estranging others (Brown, 1991). In contrast, boys, who at this stage of development see themselves as more independent and autonomous, may face a struggle of trying not to present an overly selfish self.

Future research on the development of self and silencing in adolescence surely needs to explore self silencing in a variety of settings (e.g., school or home) to explore how much socialization factors (e.g., gender

expectations, cultural expectations) contribute to girls and boys silencing.

APPENDIX A: Adaptation of The Silencing the Self Scale

Underlined words are replacements of original wording indicated by parenthesis. Items are listed according to subscales suggested by Jack. Factor placement is indicated in parenthesis: (NES) = Negative Externalized Self, (UI) = Unselfish Imperative, (FS) = False Self, (SF) = Silencing Feelings.

Please circle the choice that best describes how you feel about each of the statements below.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Jack's Subscale 1: Externalized Self-Perception

6. I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me. (NES)

7. I feel unhappy (dissatisfied) with myself because I should be able to do all the things people are supposed to be able to do these days. (NES)

23. When I make decisions, other people's thoughts and opinions influence me more than my own thoughts and opinions. (UI)

27. I often feel responsible for other people's feelings. (NES)

28. I find it hard to know what I think and feel because I spend a lot of time thinking about how other people are feeling. (NES)

31. I never seem to measure up to the standards I set for

myself. (NES)

Subscale 2: Care as Self-Sacrifice

1. I think it is best to put myself first because no one else will look out for me. (FS)
3. Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own. (UI)
4. Considering my needs to be as important as those of other people I love is selfish. (UI)
9. In a close relationship, my responsibility is to make the other person happy. (UI)
10. Caring means choosing to do what the other person wants, even when I want to do something different. (UI)
11. In order to feel good about myself, I need to be able to feel independent and able to take care of myself (self sufficient). (NES)
12. One of the worse things I can do is be selfish. (UI)
22. Doing things for myself is just selfish. (UI)
29. In a close relationship, I don't care what we do, as long as the other person is happy. (UI)

Subscale 3: Silencing the Self

2. I don't speak my feelings in a close (intimate) relationship when I know they will cause disagreement. (SF)
8. When my best friend's (partner's) needs and feelings are not the same as mine (conflict with my own), I always state mine clearly. (SF)
14. Instead of risking conflict (confrontations) in close relationships, I would rather not upset things (rock the

boat). (SF)

15. I speak my feelings with my best friend (partner) even when it leads to problems or disagreements. (SF)

18. When my best friend's (partner's) needs or opinions conflict with mine, rather than asserting my own point of view, I usually end up agreeing with him/her. (UI)

20. When it looks as though certain of my needs can't be met in a friendship (relationship) I realize that they were not very important anyway. (UI)

24. I rarely express my anger at those close to me. (SF)

26. I think that it is better to keep my feelings to myself when they conflict with my best friend's (partner's). (SF)

30. I try to bury my feelings when I think they will cause trouble in my close relationships. (SF)

Subscale 4: Divided Self

5. I find it harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship than when I am on my own. (FS)

13. I feel I have to act in a certain way to please my friends (partner). (FS)

16. Often I look happy enough on the outside, but inwardly I feel angry and rebellious. (NES)

17. In order for my best friend (partner) to like (love) me, I cannot reveal certain things about myself. (FS)

19. When I am in a close relationship, I lose my sense of who I am. (FS)

21. My best friend likes (partner loves) and appreciates me for who I am. (FS)

25. I feel that my best friend (partner) does not know my real self. (FS)

APPENDIX B: Friendship Quality Questionnaire

Items are rated by the following scale:

(0) not at all true (1) a little true (2) somewhat true
(4) pretty true (5) really true

Subscale/item.

Validation and Caring ($\alpha = .90$)

My best friend _____ (participant fills in the blank),

- 15. makes me feel good about my ideas.
- 4. tells me I am good at things.
- 6. and I make each other important and special
- 13. tells me I am pretty smart.
- 8. says "I'm sorry" if he/she hurts my feelings.
- 5. sticks up for me if others talk behind my back.
- 10. has good ideas about games to play.
- 41. cares about my feelings.
- 12. would like me even if others didn't.
- 30. does not tell others my secrets.

Conflict Resolution ($\alpha = .73$)

My best friend _____

- 26. and I make up easily when we have a fight.
- 35. and I get over our arguments really quickly.
- 11. and I talk about how to get over being mad at each other.

Conflict and Betrayal ($\alpha = .84$)

My best friend and I _____

- 20. argue a lot.
- 27. fight a lot.
- 3. get mad a lot.
- 31. bug each other a lot.

My best friend _____

9. sometimes says mean things about me to other kids.
21. is someone I can count on to keep promises.

Help and Guidance ($\alpha = .90$)

My best friend _____

34. helps me so I can get done quicker.
24. gives advice when figuring things out.
32. comes up with good ideas on how to get things done.

My best friend and I...

39. help each other with school work a lot.
36. count on each other for good ideas about how to get things done.
28. share things with each other.
18. do special favors for one another.
17. help each other with chores a lot.

Companionship and Recreation ($\alpha = .75$)

My best friend and I....

2. always sit together at lunch.
7. always pick each other for partners for things.
23. always play together at recess.
19. do fun things together a lot.
22. go to each others houses

Intimate Exchange ($\alpha = .86$)

My best friend and I....

14. always tell each other our problems.
25. talk about the things that make us sad.
16. talk to each other when were mad about something.
40. tell each other our secrets.
38. tell each other private things.
29. talk about how to make ourselves feel better if we are mad at each other.

APPENDIX C: Friendship Participation Item

Friendship participation. In this survey you will be asked many questions about your friendships. Please refer to your current closest friend when answering all questions.

In our study we define a close friends as kids you know very well. A close friend would be someone you spend a lot of time with in and out of school, and is someone you talk to about things that happen in your life.

Check the statement that is most like you:

- ☐ I have one close friend or "best friend"
- ☐ I have two or more close friends or best friends
- ☐ I have friends but not really a close friend
- ☐ I have classmates I hang with, but I don't call them friends

This friend, my closest friend is: female _____ male _____

His/her name is _____

APPENDIX D: Friendship Importance Evaluation

Read both parts of the sentences which follow. For each sentence choose one box and mark it with an "x" to show which statement is most like you. Do not mark both sides. Just mark the side which is most like you.

- 1) Some kids don't think that having a lot of friends is all that important BUT other kids think that having a lot of friends is important to how they feel as a person.

Really
True
for me

Sort of
True for
me

Sort of
True for
me

Really
True
for me

- 2) Some kids think that it is important to be popular BUT other kids don't think being popular is all important to how they feel about themselves.

Really
True
for me

Sort of
True for
me

Sort of
True for
me

Really
True
for me

APPENDIX E: Self-Orientation

Please come up with five words that you would use to describe yourself.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Please fill in all blanks!

APPENDIX F: Criteria for Self-Orientation Categorization

Instructions to graduate student raters:

Using the forced choice technique, classify the words into one of the following three categories:

Category ID: Words about personal qualities, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors, states and traits that DO NOT relate to other people. Examples: "honest, intelligent, and happy."

Category GR: Words about group membership, demographic characteristics, and groups with which people experience a common fate. Examples: "Roman Catholic" (membership in a religious group); daughter (membership in a family group); football player (membership in a recreational group).

Category Allo: Statements about interdependence, friendship, responsiveness to others, sensitivity to how others perceive you. Examples: "kind, helper, sensitive."

APPENDIX G: Scoring Procedure for Self-Orientation Categorization

To obtain scores in each category, the items were weighted according to their position in rank order. The first descriptor was assigned a value of 5, the second a 4, the third a 3, the fourth a 2, and the fifth a 1. Next, three scores were determined for each participant, (Independent, Group and Relational) by summing the totals for each category for each participant. For example, if items 1 and 3 fell in the category independent, the participant got a score of 8, scores of $(5+3)$ in this category. If response 2 and 5 were relational descriptors, the participant would get a score of $(4+1)= 5$. If the final word fell in the group category and was in position 4, the participant would get a score of 2 for group orientation. In each category scores could range from 0-15, with each participant getting a score in each category.

APPENDIX H: Consent Form to Participants

Dear Parents:

My name is Mimi Bommersbach, and I am a graduate student in Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. I am conducting a study on how adolescents experience "self" in the context of their friendships. Your permission and your child's participation will help me complete a research project for my Master's thesis.

I will be coming to your child's classroom next week and will be passing out surveys for students to complete. The survey is made up of sixty questions and will take about 40 minutes to complete. All answers will be kept confidential. Students' names will not be on completed surveys.

Your child's participation is voluntary. He/she will be instructed that at any time they do not want to continue with the survey, they can stop. A sample question reads, "Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own." Your son/daughter will be asked to rate questions like these as to how true they are for them.

This study and the questions in it have been reviewed

and approved for use by the Institutional Review Board at California State University, San Bernardino.

By signing the following consent form you will indicate that you understand:

- 1) that all responses will remain anonymous
- 2) that your child can decline to participate at any time
- 3) that this survey involves minimal risk to students

Thank you for your helping me to complete this research project! Your child's participation is really appreciated! If you have any further questions about this survey or your child's participation, please contact me or my advisor at the numbers below.

Mimi Bommersbach

(805) 646-3971

Dr. Joanna Worthley

CSUSB Associate Professor

(909) 880-5595

I have agreed to allow my daughter/son

_____ to participate in this study.

_____ (parent or guardian)

I understand my rights as a participant and agree to participate in the above study.

_____ (student)

APPENDIX I: Demographic Items

Please mark whether you are male or female:

female_____ male_____

Please tell which ethnicity best describes you:

_____ African American/Black	_____ American Indian
_____ Hispanic/Latino(a)	_____ White/Caucasian
_____ Asian American/Asian	_____ other
	(describe) _____

What is your age? _____ (years) _____ (months)

What is your grade? _____

Appendix J: Debriefing

Thank you for filling out the questionnaires. All of you did very well in helping me with my study. There are no "right" and "wrong" answers to these questions. Rather, these questions get at how you feel and what you experience in your friendships. The purpose of this questionnaire is to help us understand more about friendships and how they affect our experience of self.

I want you to know that the answers you gave to these questions will remain completely anonymous. That means no one will know who answered these questions. That is why your name is not anywhere on the questionnaire.

Do you have any comments or questions about the questionnaire? If you have any further questions regarding this study, your teacher has my phone number, and I would be happy to answer any questions. Also, if you would like to know the results of my study, they will be available after the end of September.

If the questions you answered brought up any thoughts and feelings that make you uncomfortable for any reason, you may want to talk with your parents, teacher, or school guidance counselor about them.

Thanks again for helping me with my study.

REFERENCES

- Allende, I. (1994). An evening with Isabel Allende. Lecture at California State University San Bernardino sponsored by Phi Kappa Phi.
- American Psychological Association (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. American Psychologist, 47, 1597-1611.
- Averill, J. (1982). Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bevan, W. (1991). Contemporary Psychology: A tour inside the onion. American Psychologist, 46(5), 475-483.
- Bochner, S. (1994). Cross-cultural differences in the self-concept: A test of Hofstede's individualism/collectivism distinction. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25(2), 273-283.
- Bohan, J. (1994). Every answer is a question. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association. Los Angeles, CA.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment. Volume 1 of Attachment and loss. New York: Basic Books.
- Block, J. H. (1984). Sex role identity and ego development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.

- Brown, L. M. (1991a). A problem of vision: The development of voice and relational knowledge in girls ages seven to sixteen. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1&2, 52-71.
- Brown, L. M. (1991b). Telling a life: Self authorization as a form of resistance. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers, & D. L. Tolman (Eds.), Women, girls, and psychotherapy: Reframing resistance in therapy, (pp. 71-86). New York: Haworth Press.
- Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girl's development. New York: Ballentine Books.
- Brown, L., & Gilligan, C. (1993). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girl's development. Feminism & Psychology, 3(1), 11-35.
- Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1987). The development of companionship and intimacy. Child Development, 58, 1101-1113.
- Cowan, G., Bommersbach, M., & Curtis, S. (1995). Codependency, loss of self and power. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19, 221-236.
- Crockett, L., Losoff, M., & Petersen, A. C. (1984). Perceptions of the peer group and friendship in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 4, 155-181.
- Doherty, P. & Cook, E. P. (1992). No woman is an island. In E. Piel Cook (Ed.), Women, relationships and power: Implications for counseling, (pp. 15-46). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Dupuy, P. (1994). Women in intimate relationships. In E. Piel Cook (Ed.), Women, relationships and power, (pp. 79-108). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

- Freud, S. (1925). Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. In J. Strachey, ed. and trans., The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud. London: Hogarth Press.
- Gibbs, J., & Widaman, K. (1982). Social intelligence: Measuring the development of sociomoral reflection. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Erikson, E. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Faludi, S. (1991). Backlash: The undeclared war against American women. New York: Anchor Books.
- Farrell, W. (1986). Why men are the way they are. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gilligan, C. (1995). Remembering Iphigenia: Voice, resonance, and a talking cure. Paper presented at Women's growth in connection: New directions from the Stone Center and the Harvard Project on girls and women. Symposium held in Los Angeles, CA.
- Gilligan, C. (1991). Women's psychological development: Implications of psychotherapy. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers, & D. Tolman (Eds.), Women, girls & psychotherapy. New York: Haworth Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., Johnson, D. K., & Miller, B. (1988). Moral voice, adolescent development, and secondary education: A study at Green River School (Monograph No. 3). Cambridge, MA: Project on the Psychology of Women and the Development of Girls, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

- Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. P., & Hanmer, T. J. (1990). Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard school. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Rogers, A. G. (1993). Strengthening healthy resistance and courage in girls: A prevention project and a developmental study. Report for Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Gilligan, C., Rogers, A. G., & Tolman, D. L. (1992). Women, girls and psychotherapy: Reframing resistance. New York: Haworth Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Stiver, I. (1995). Women's growth in connection: New directions from the Stone Center and the Harvard project on girls and women. Symposium held in Los Angeles, CA.
- Gilligan, C., Ward, J., & Taylor, J. (1988). Mapping the moral domain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gratch, L. V., Bassett, M. E., & Attra, S. L. (1995). The relationship of gender and ethnicity to self-silencing and depression among college students. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19, 509-515.
- Gray, J. (1993). Men are from Mars, women are from Venus. New York: Harper Collins.
- Guisinger, S., & Blatt, S. J. (1994). Individuality and relatedness: Evolution of a fundamental dialectic. American Psychologist, 49(2), 104-111.
- Gurian, A. (1987). Depression in young girls: Early sorrows and depressive disorders. In R. Formanek & A. Gurian (Eds.), Women and depression: A lifespan perspective, (pp. 57-83). New York: Springer.
- Harding, S. (1987). Feminism and Methodology. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

- Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. American Psychologist, 43(6), 455-463.
- Harter, S. (1985). Manual for self perception profile for children. Denver, Co.: University of Denver.
- Hausman, M. J., & Halseth, J. H. (1987). Reexamining women's roles: A feminist approach to decreasing depression in women. In C. M. Brody (Ed.), Women's therapy groups: Paradigms of feminist treatment, (pp. 217-227). New York: Springer.
- Heckman, S. J. (1995). Moral voices, moral selves: Carol Gilligan and feminist moral theory. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Henwood, K., & Pidgeon, N. (1995). Remaking the link: Qualitative research and feminist standpoint theory. Feminism & Psychology, 5(1), 7-30.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, voice and loyalty: Responses to firms, organizations and states. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holloway, J. (1991). Roles for professional psychology in environmental action: Reframing the dominant social paradigm through ecofeminism and deep ecology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Jack, J. C. (1991). Silencing the self: Women and depression. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jack, D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The Silencing the Self Scale. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 97-106.
- Jordan, J. (1997). The relational model is a source of empowerment for women. In M. R. Walsh (Ed.), Women, men and gender: Ongoing debates, (pp. 373-379). New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Jordan, J., Kaplan, A., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I., & Surrey, J. (1991). Women's growth in connection. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(5), 925-937.
- Kazdin, A. (1980). Research design in clinical psychology. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kerber, L. (1986). Some cautionary words for historians. Signs, 11(21), 304-333.
- Kelbert-Kelly, M. (1994). The patients voice as an instrument of psychoanalytic exploration. Unpublished paper given at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Los Angeles.
- Kelly, C. S. (1996). Guides to the analyses of multivariate statistics. Unpublished study guide. Los Angeles: California School of Professional Psychology.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1993). Clarence, William, Iron Mike, Tailhook, Senator Packwood, Spur Posse, Magic..and us. In E. Buchwald, P. Fletcher, & M. Roth (Eds)., Transforming a rape culture, (pp. 121-138). Minneapolis MN: Milkweed Editions.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona, (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Kutines, W. M., Alvarez, M., & Azmitia, M. (1990). Science and morality: The role of values in science and the scientific study of moral phenomena. Psychological Bulletin, 107, 283-295.
- Levinson, D. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Lovenginer, J., & Wessler, R. (1990). Measuring ego development, Vols. 1 and 2. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. Psychological Review, 98(2), 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., Mullally, P. R., & Kitayama, S. (in press). Selfways: Diversity in modes of cultural participation. In U. Neisser & D. Jopling (Eds.) The conceptual self in context.
- Mahoney, M. A. (1997). True selves and split subjects: The problem of authenticity and feminism. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Martin, J. R. (1994). Methodological essentialism, false difference, and other dangerous traps. Signs, 19 (3), 630-655.
- McGrath, E., Keita, G. P., Strickland, B. R., & Russo, N. F. (Eds.) (1990). Women and depression: Risk factors and treatment issues. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). Towards a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon.
- Miller, J. B. (1991). The construction of anger in women and men. In J. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center, (pp. 181-196). New York: Guilford Press.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Girkus, J. S. (1994). The emergence of gender differences in depression during adolescence. Psychological Bulletin, 115(3), 424-443.
- Orenstein, P. (1995). Schoolgirls: Young women, self esteem and the confidence gap. New York: Doubleday.

- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. Developmental Psychology, 29(4), 611-621.
- Piper, M. (1994). Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls. New York: Ballentine Books.
- Pleck, J. (1980). The American man. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Reinharz, S. (1991). Toward an ethnography of "voice" and "silence". In Tickett, Watts and Birm (Eds.), Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context. (pp. 178-200). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rich, A. (1977). Conditions for work: The common world of women. In S. Ruddick & P. Daniels (Eds.), Working it out, (pp. xiv-xxiv). New York: Pantheon.
- Ritter, K. Y. (1993). Depression in women. In E. P. Cook (Ed.), Women, relationships and power: Implications for counseling, (pp. 139-178). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Rogers, A. G. (1993). Voice, play and practice of ordinary courage in girls' and women's lives. Harvard Educational Review, 63(3), 265-295.
- Sampson, E. E. (1989). The challenge of social change for psychology: Globalization and psychology's theory of the person. American Psychologist, 44(6), 914-920.
- Sampson, E. E. (1993). Identity politics. American Psychologist, 48(12), 1219-1230.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development and death. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.

- Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. E. (1981). Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship. Developmental Psychology, 18, 721-732.
- Siegel, R. J. (1988). Women's "dependency" in a male-centered value system: Gender-based values regarding dependency and independence. Women & Therapy, 7(1), 113-123.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20(5), 580-591.
- Steiner-Adair, C. (1991). When the body speaks: Girls, eating disorders and psychotherapy. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers, & D. L. Tolman (Eds.), Women, girls and psychotherapy, (pp. 253-266). New York: Haworth Press.
- Stern, D. (1986). The interpersonal world of the infant. New York: Basic books.
- Stern, L. (1991). Disavowing the self in female adolescence. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers, & D. L. Tolman (Eds.), Women, girls and psychotherapy. New York: Haworth Press.
- Stivers, C. (1993). Reflections on the role of the personal narrative in social science. Signs, 18(21), 408-425.
- Surrey, J. (1983). The self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. In J. Jordan, A. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. Stiver & J. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection, (pp. 51-66). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tavris, C. (1992). The mismeasure of women. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thoits, P. A. (1983). Dimensions of life events that influence psychological distress: An evaluation and synthesis of the literature. In H. B. Kaplan (Ed.), Psychological stress: Trends in theory and research, (pp. 33-103). New York: Academic.

Thomas, S. P. (Ed.) (1993). Women and anger. New York: Springer.

Tolman, D. L., & Debold, E. (1994). Conflicts of body and image: Female adolescents, desire and the no-body conflict. In, P. Fallon, M. A. Katzman, & S. C. Wooley, (Eds.), Feminist Perspectives in eating disorders, (pp. 301-317). New York: Guilford Press.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 323-338.

Way, N. (1995). Can't you see the courage, the strength that I have? Listening to Urban Adolescent girls speak about their relationships. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19, 107-128.

Weissman, M. M., & Klerman, G. L., (1977). Gender differences and depression. Trends in Neuroscience, 8, 416-420.

Westcott, M. C. (1997). On the new psychology of women: A cautionary view. In M. R. Walsh (Ed.), Women, men and gender: Ongoing debates, (pp. 373-379). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Winnicott, D. (1965). The theory of the parent-infant relationship. In D. Winnicott (Ed.), The maturational processes and the facilitating environment. New York: International.

Worthley, J. S. (1992). Is science persistence a matter of values? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 57-68.